

A letter from the Government, dated 25th November 1835, states that "under the circumstances represented, **General.** from which it appears that it would lead to considerable further delay to prepare and execute a new device for the gold coin proposed to be issued (with the name of the coin in English within a wreath instead of the lion,) whereas the coinage of double mohurs can be immediately commenced if the die cut with the device according to the design of Flaxman be adopted, the Governor General has been induced to waive his objection to the representation of an animal upon the gold coin of India, and to approve the adoption of this device."

The details of the new coinage were finally laid down by Acts XVII and XXII 1835.

---

*Græco-Roman Influence on the Civilization of Ancient India. Supplementary Note.*—By VINCENT ARTHUR SMITH, M. R. A. S., *Indian Civil Service.*

Sir Alexander Cunningham has favoured me with communications which enable me to make certain corrections in and additions to my second paper on *Græco-Roman Influence on the Civilization of Ancient India*, published in the *Journal of this Society* for 1892<sup>1</sup>.

Concerning the short record dated in the year 68, and numbered II. by M. Senart, I remarked (*page 56 of my paper*):—"It is not known to what object it was attached, but doubtless it was a sculpture of some sort." M. Senart's words are (*page 21 of his paper*):—"Le lieu d'origine de cette courte inscription ne m'est pas connu. Il est probable que, comme presque tous les monuments réunis au musée de Lahore, elle vient du pays des Yusufzais, sur la rive gauche du fleuve de Caboul, de Jamalgarhi, de Takht i Bahi, ou des environs.

Les caractères occupent une longueur de 97 centimètres; on peut en estimer à 3 centimètres et demi la hauteur moyenne. La hauteur de la pierre est de 10 centimètres. Ignorant jusqu'à sa provenance, nous n'avons bien entendu aucun renseignement sur l'objet qu'elle accompagnait primitivement."

Sir A. Cunningham, in a letter dated 17th June, 1892, clears up all doubts as to the place from which the inscription came, and proves that I was mistaken in guessing that it had been directly attached to a sculpture of some sort.

<sup>1</sup> See J. A. S. B. Vol. LXI, Part I for 1892, p. 50 Ed.

He writes :—"Regarding the inscription of S. 68 published by M. Senart, I can say that it was on a very large rough stone, which may have been inserted in a wall, but which could not have been the base of a statue. It was 5 feet 9 inches long, and from 3 feet to 1 foot 9 inches in breadth. The legend was on the edge. It weighed 12 maunds 7 seers [= 1008 lbs. avoirdupois, = 457 kilogrammes], when I got it, but I cut it down to 4 maunds 3 seers, before sending it to the Lahore Museum, where, as I conclude from your account, it is left unregistered as presented by General Cunningham—from Máji, 4 or 5 miles to the south of Fatchjang, ancient Chása, and to the south-west of Ráwal Pindi."<sup>1</sup>

The inscription is certainly in the Lahore Museum, because M. Senart expressly states at the beginning of his essay that all the monuments described by him belong to that museum, and were communicated to him by the curator, Mr. L. Kipling.

Concerning the dated Hashtnagar inscription (*page 55 of my paper*) Sir A. Cunningham says that "The date may be either 274 or 284, but it cannot, I think, be referred to 78 A. D." I have already given up the suggestion to refer this date to the Śaka era, and have assumed that the approximate date of the inscribed pedestal is A. D. 220 or 230. Sir A. Cunningham observes that the Panjtár inscription of a Gushán, or Kushán, Mahárája, dated S. 122 is the latest "which can be referred to A. D. 78." If that record is rightly referred to the Śaka era its date will be A. D. 200, which is not far from the approximate date obtained for the Hashtnagar inscription by using the era of Moga or Gondophares. I think it may now be safely assumed that the use of the Gandharian (Kharoshtrí) character in Gándhára survived into the first half of the third century A. D. The disuse of this character in India proper does not imply its disuse in Gándhára. It is, no doubt, true that the Gandharian character is not used on the coins of Vasudeva, of whom we have an inscription in old Nágari characters dated S. 98, = A. D. 176, and that coins of Kanishka (KANHPKO) and Vasudeva (BAZOΔHO) which Sir A. Cunningham believes to be posthumous, bear legends in old Nágari. But I see no difficulty in believing that at the same time the Gandharian character had a limited local currency for some purposes within the region of Gándhára.

When quoting (*page 59*) Prof. Rhys Davids, as authority for identifying the "village" Kalasi in the "island" of Alasanda, where king Milinda (Menander) was born, with the *Karisi nagara*, or town of Karisi

<sup>1</sup> For a notice of Fatchjang, see Archæological Survey Reports, Vol. XIV, p. 24.

mentioned on a coin of Eukratides (*circa* B. C. 190), I was not aware that the identification had been made long before by Sir Alexander Cunningham, who published it in the *Numismatic Chronicle* for 1869, and again two years later in his 'Ancient Geography of India.'<sup>1</sup>

Sir Alexander Cunningham is of opinion that in the passage quoted by me from Prof. Rhys Davids' translation of the 'Questions of King Milinda,'—"There is an island called Alasanda. It was there I was born,"—the word *dīpa* (Sanskrit *dwīpa*) should be translated 'region' or 'division of the world' rather than 'island.' He cites in support of this rendering the well known compound *Jambūdwīpa*, and takes *Alasandadīpa* to mean "the country of which Alasanda was the capital," Kalasi being "the same as Alasanda itself."

If, in the passage quoted, the word *dīpa* does not mean 'island', there is, apparently, no reason for supposing the Alexandria in question to have been on the Indus. Sir A. Cunningham places it, as will be seen from the passage to be quoted presently, at a village named Opían or Hupían, 27½ miles north of Kábul. Whatever be the true position of Alexandria or Alasanda, Prof. Rhys Davids' note at page 127 of the 'Questions of King Milinda' referring to "Alexandria (in Bactria) built on an island in the Indus," is not quite accurate. The Indus was never included within the limits of Bactria, though the banks of the river may at times have been included in the dominions of the Bactrian kings.

My quotation (*same page*) from Professor Percy Gardner was also unfortunate. He describes the legend on the rare coin of Eukratides, giving the name of the town of Karisi as being "the conjectured reading of General Cunningham." This remark is inaccurate. The only word at all doubtful in the reading of the legend on the coin referred to, was *devata*, and the reading of this word has lately, Sir A. Cunningham assures me, been definitely established by a second specimen of the coin. The reading of the name 'Karisí' on the coin was never doubtful.

In order to prevent any further misconception, and to show clearly Sir A. Cunningham's views concerning the probable situation of Alexandria, = Alasanda or Alasadda, = Kalasi, presumably identical with Karisi, I had better quote in full the relevant passage from the 'Ancient Geography of India,' page 28, which is as follows:—

"If I am right in identifying Begrám with the Kiu-lu-sa-pang of

<sup>1</sup> Prof. Rhys Davids informs me that he also was unaware that Sir A. Cunningham had made the identification previously, and will gladly take the opportunity of the impending publication of the second volume of the 'Milinda' to acquaint his readers with the fact.

the Chinese pilgrim, the true name of the place must have been *Karsana*, as written by Ptolemy, and not *Cartana*, as noted by Pliny. The same form of the name is also found on a rare coin of Eukratides, with the legend *Karisiye nagara*, or 'city of Karisi', which I have identified with the *Kalasi* of the Buddhist chronicles, as the birthplace of Raja Milindu. In another passage of the same chronicle,<sup>1</sup> Milindu is said to have been born at *Alasanda*, or Alexandria, the capital of the *Yona*, or Greek country. *Kalasi* must, therefore, have been either Alexandria itself, or some place close to it. The latter conclusion agrees exactly with the position of *Begrám*, which is only a few miles to the east of *Opián*. Originally two distinct places, like *Delhi* and *Sháh Jahánábád*, or *London* and *Westminster*, I suppose *Opián* and *Karsana* to have gradually approached each other as they increased in size, until at last they virtually became one large city. On the coins of the earlier Greek kings of Ariana,—*Euthydemus*, *Demetrius*, and *Eukratides*,—we find the monograms of both cities; but, after the time of *Eukratides*, that of *Opiana* disappears altogether, while that of *Karsana* is common to most of the later princes. The contemporary occurrence of these mint monograms proves that the two cities were existing at the same time; while the sudden disuse of the name of *Opián* may serve to show that, during the latter period of Greek occupation, the city of *Alexandria* had been temporarily supplanted by *Karsana*."

The *Alexandria* above referred to is the city founded by *Alexander*, and described by *Pliny* as "*Alexandria Opianes*", situated "sub ipso *Caneaso*". The modern name of the site identified with it is said to be variously spelled *Opián*, *Opiyán*, and (*Malik*) *Hupián*.

The *Maháwanso* calls *Alasanna* "the city, or capital, of the *Yona* country", *Yona naggardálasanna*. (*Turnour*, page 171). *Turnour* himself writes the name as *Alasadda*.

I have not specially studied the ancient geography of Ariana, and therefore abstain from pronouncing any personal opinion on the geographical questions raised in the preceding extracts.

<sup>1</sup> *Milindu-prasna*, quoted by *Hardy*, in 'Manual of Buddhism', pp. 440, 516.